
**COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY
MINUTES**

September 6, 2002 Meeting
9:00 a.m. - 2:30 p.m.

Arizona State Courts Building
Conference Room 119 A & B
1501 West Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

MEMBERS PRESENT

Louraine Arkfeld
Kent Batty
Michael Baumstark
Robert Dorfman
Bill Druke for J. William
Brammer, Jr.
Gordon Griller
Jeanne Hicks
Michael Jeanes
John Kennedy
Donna Killoughey
Gary Krcmarik
Martin Krizay
Al Madrid
Edward Voss

MEMBERS ABSENT

Ruth McGregor
James Soto

GUESTS

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz, TAC
John Barrett, TAC
Ron Beguin, TAC
Tom Brady, CACC
Judith Connell
Janet Cornell, CACC
John Coward
Diane Drain
Daniel W. Edwards, TAC
Nicholas Felber
Joan Harphant, TAC
Donald Jacobson, CACC
Kim Johnson
Denise Lundin
Cary Meister
Gordon Mulleneaux, CACC
Sheri Newman
Gregg Obuch, CACC
Michael Pollard, CACC
Rick Rager
Sarah Shew
Eloise Price, TAC
Marcus Reinkensmeyer, CACC
Will Tagart, TAC

AOC STAFF PRESENT

Theresa Barrett
Kate Bibber
Bobbie Chinsky
William Earl
Gary Graham
Jim Ham
Maureen Haggerty
Karl Heckart
Paul Hrisho
Tim Lawler
Adele May
Frances Mitok
Stephanie Nolan
Pamela Peet
Pamela Pucetas
Janet Scheiderer
Ted Wilson
Amy Wood

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Mike Baumstark called the meeting of the Commission on Technology (COT) to order on September 6, 2002 at 9:30 a.m. Serving as chair at the request of Vice Chief Justice McGregor, he welcomed members, staff and guests present. He announced new members for the 2003 fiscal year and thanked those who had served. New members included: Hon. J. William Brammer, Jr., Ms. Donna Killoughey, Mr. Alfred Madrid, and Hon. James Soto. Members introduced themselves giving their name and position.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the June 20 and 21, 2002 Commission on Technology meeting. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-09

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS: 2003

There were no new legislative proposals for the Commission on Technology to consider.

FUNDING WORKGROUP REPORT

The Funding Workgroup consisted of the following members: Mike Baumstark, Greg Eades, Gary Krcmarik, Denise Lundin, Gordon Mulleneaux, Rick Rager and staffed by Frances Mitok. Gary introduced the presentation and outlined the group's activities since the June meeting when they were charged with recommending funding options. Mike reviewed the JCEF/TCPF revenue and expense projections handout. Gordon depicted the impact of increasing local participation in the support of ACAP expenses, including an increase in the device fee and an increase in the large court share of desktop costs. The centralized citation project, with the possibility of increased collections, and adding a local fee were also discussed. They also recommended further exploring value-added fees for providing data.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded that based on the premise of 1% growth, to approve the increase of the Arizona Court Automation Project's equipment charges from the current \$500 to \$750 annually in fiscal year 2005 and to \$1000 in fiscal year 2009. The motion passed with a vote of 8 to 4. TECH-02-010

Members also requested that the AOC prepare a detailed document outlining the costs of equipment and services provided by the state judiciary. It was noted that currently, the equipment acquisition and support costs for ACAP are approximately \$2100 each. Mike Jeanes requested more detail from the projection spreadsheet to understand the development costing cycle, especially in 2008 and 2009.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded that based on the premise of 1% growth, to approve the increase of the large volume courts' portion of desktop equipment acquisition from the current 25% to 40% in fiscal year 2005 and to 50% in fiscal year 2009. The motion passed with 1 dissenting vote. TECH-02-011

Members had considerable discussion of the current level of support for the field trainers and expressed concern for inflation factors that were not reflected in the recommendation.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded that based on the premise of 1% growth, to approve funding the field trainer program through fiscal year 2009 by matching salary and benefits up to \$25,000 per county and covering travel costs for field trainer central training and meetings. The funding level is to be reviewed annually. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-012

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to form a study group to further explore value-added fees for data as provided in Supreme Court Rule 123. The Technical Advisory Council should be included in the workgroup. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-013

CENTRALIZED PROCESSING WORKGROUP

The Centralized Processing Workgroup consisted of the following members: Mohyeddin Abdulaziz, Gordon Mulleneaux, Gordon Griller, Bob James, Diane Drain, Rick Rager, Sue Hall, Joan Harphant, Ted Wilson, Sheri Newman, Kim Johnson, Odette Apodaca, Eloise Price and Mark Stodola and staffed by Pam Pucetas. Joan Harphant presented the groups activities and recommendations. The group suggested a change of committee name to Enterprise Leveraged Automation Committee (ELAC) to more reflect their mission, especially since “centralized” had a negative connotation. She focused on the importance of coordinating and leveraging efforts.

Joan presented an analysis tool that the group devised to evaluate a project in terms of coordination factors and suggest the appropriate level of coordination. Members had a lively discussion on many issues relating to the process flow and potential bureaucratic delays. The group recommended adopting the tool and delaying the decision on both jury and electronic document management system (EDMS) software until a committee of stakeholders could consider these projects in more detail.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to continue development of the analysis tool. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-14

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to form a workgroup of stakeholders interested in the EDMS standard to make a recommendation at the November 2002 meeting on the degree of automation leveraging. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-15

Justice McGregor will ask Superior Court Clerks of Court as well as other interested parties from limited jurisdictions to participate in this EDMS Software Workgroup.

A discussion of jury software ensued since the jury software implemented last summer in Maricopa Superior Court is under consideration as an alternative standard for courts statewide per motion TECH-01-45 at the COT January 5, 2001 meeting. Ms. Sheri Newman supported remaining with current jury software standard and stated that she and several clerks had seen a demonstration of both the upgraded

version of the existing system and Maricopa's new system. She felt that a cursory review of the costs indicated that converting to the upgraded version of the current jury software was less expensive than switching to a new product and vendor; further, they do not wish to change vendors. Mr. Griller noted that Maricopa's experience with their jury vendor has been less than positive and stated that the upgraded version of the current statewide standard jury system seemed equivalent, if not better.

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to permit the jury commissioners to move forward with Jury+ upgrading. The motion passed with one dissenting vote. TECH-02-16

e-filer REPORT

Judge Druke described the history and environment of the *e-filer* project and outlined the planned enhancements. He noted that 70 attorneys and 550 criminal cases have been involved to-date. Mr. Abdulaziz described and demonstrated the e-filing process on Division 2's web site. They noted that most of the judges and staff are quite comfortable with viewing documents on screen but that some will occasionally print a document or portion of a transcript for one reason or another (i.e., to share with someone else, take home to read on the weekend, etc.) They also noted that less tracking and handling of the paper file provided efficiencies that counter balanced the minimal printing that takes place.

ARIZONA JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY STRATEGIC PLAN: 2003-2005

MOTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the *Arizona Judicial Department Information Technology Strategic Plan: 2003-2005*. The motion passed unanimously. TECH-02-17

REPORT OF STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES

COURT AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE (CACC) REPORT

Judge Pollard and Marcus Reinkensmeyer, co-chairs, updated members on committee activity. Primarily, they focused on AZTEC 1.0 enhancements that will shortly be rolled out and on the MCAP Financials project approach and status. They outlined fiscal year 2003's goals for court automation.

PROBATION AUTOMATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE (PACC) REPORT

William Earl, staff to PACC, updated members on the status of PACC initiatives. He noted that their primary goal was to support the rollout of APETS to the central corridor. Probation management is currently doing a financial analysis and funding availability review. In November, they hope to report on a specific plan. They are also working on probation data sharing guidelines and policies.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL (TAC) REPORT

Karl Heckart outlined TAC's planned activities for fiscal year, including 1) ad hoc reporting tool selection; 2) participation in the Open Court XML Interface (OXCI) development, a national effort to develop common middleware for electronic filing; and, 3) operational coordination and security policies. He noted that the new approach to building software that supports large courts creating their own plug-ins necessitated greater coordination and communication of all development efforts.

CIO REPORT

Karl Heckart updated members on the status of statewide initiatives. Highlights are as follows:

- The leased PC-refresh is in progress with 1200 of 1700 PCs replaced. Several meeting participants complimented the field support group on the installation.
- There may be a migration from Informix to DB2 and analysis is in progress. The MCAP Financial module is being written with DB2 in mind.
- The Central Citation Processing Bureau project is beginning with an RFP for a consultant. The study of requirements should begin in October.
- The domestic violence repository is nearly complete with the major municipal courts contributing or ready to test.
- Several integration projects with DPS are underway and involve data sharing and electronic dispositions.
- Bulk data requests from various businesses are becoming more frequent.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.